

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1-14 will have been canceled and claims 15-21 will have newly been submitted for reconsideration by the Examiner. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents in the Official Action.

Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statements filed in the present application on December 15, 2004 and January 3, 2005 by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 Forms, and for consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statements.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has objected to the specification because of informalities. By the present amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to eliminate the phrase "kind of". Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. By the present amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 without

prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by SHIMA (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0004802).

As noted above, Applicant has canceled claims 1-14, and has submitted new claims 15-21. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection based on the newly added claims 15-21 and will discuss the outstanding rejection with respect to these claims in the present application as will be set forth hereinbelow. The newly added claims merely clarify the subject matter recited in the canceled claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Applicant's claims 15-19 generally relate to a terminal apparatus which comprises an interface configured to be connected to a scanner apparatus via a network. The terminal apparatus comprises a memory which stores a plurality of information indicating a plurality of file types and a plurality of application programs associated with the plurality of the file types. Each of the plurality of the application programs is utilized for opening a document file associated with each of the plurality of the file types. The terminal apparatus comprises a controller which receives, from the scanner apparatus, a control file including a file name, and receives, from the scanner apparatus, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner apparatus. The controller also analyzes the file name included in the received control file to obtain the file type of the received document file, and starts the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file. Claim 20 recites related system, and claim 21 recites a related method.

In direct contrast, SHIMA relates to a computer peripheral device, e.g., a scanner which receives a HTTP request from an information terminal, extracts a URL from the received HTTP request, looks up in the management table 50 based on the extracted URL, and converts the extracted URL into setup values for realizing a predetermined process. For, example, when the scanner receives an URL of "http://xxx/B600.html" from the information terminal, the scanner converts the received URL into setup value for realizing a process of "reading image data at read resolution 600 dpi processed by error diffusion method" (see. paragraphs [0011] and [0017]).

However, SHIMA does not disclose an information terminal which stores a plurality of application programs. Rather, SHIMA provides for using a image information input-output device, e.g., a scanner, without installing driver software in the information terminal (see. paragraphs [0012] and [0149]). Thus, in SHIMA, the information terminal does not store driver software.

Further, SHIMA does not disclose an information terminal which stores a plurality of information indicating a plurality of file types and a plurality of application programs associated with the plurality of the file types. Rather, although SHIMA discloses management table 50 which stores URL elements and corresponding setup selection values (Fig.4), the management table 50 is a component of the scanner 41, but is not a component of the information terminal 61 (Fig.3). In direct contrast, Applicant's claims recite the memory to be part of the terminal apparatus, not part of the scanner.

Further, the management table 50 of SHIMA does not store a plurality of information indicating a plurality of file types and a plurality of application programs associated with the plurality of the file types. Rather, the management table 50 of

P21953. A03

SHIMA stores URL elements and corresponding setup selection values (Fig.4). For example, when a URL indicates "http://xxx/B600.html", "B600" of the URL is a URL element and indicates "reading image data at read resolution 600 dpi" as the corresponding setup selection value (see. paragraph [0117]). Thus, the URL element does not indicate information indicating a file type, and the corresponding setup selection value does not indicate an application program associated with the file type. Rather, SHIMA saves a user from installing driver software in the information terminal (see. paragraphs [0012] and [0149]).

On the other hand, the present invention relates to a terminal apparatus connectable to a scanner apparatus via a network. The terminal apparatus stores a plurality of information indicating a plurality of file types and a plurality of application programs associated with the plurality of the file types, each of the plurality of the application programs being utilized for opening a document file associated with each of the plurality of the file types. The terminal apparatus further receives, from the scanner apparatus, a control file including a file name, receives, from the scanner apparatus, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner apparatus, analyzes the file name included in the received control file to obtain the file type of the received document file, and starts the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file.

Thus, the pending claims are clearly distinguished over SHIMA.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant's claims 15-21 are not disclosed in SHIMA cited by the Examiner.

P21953. A03

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejection, and requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application, in due course.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**


Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has canceled the rejected claims and has submitted new claims for reconsideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicant has pointed out the features thereof and has contrasted the features of the new claims with the disclosures of the reference. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Yutaka IYOKI

William Pieprz  
Reg. No. 33,630



---

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

August 2, 2005  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191